

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

SANDI WILSON and SYNTHIA LISI,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

VENTURE FINANCIAL GROUP, INC.,
et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C09-5768BHS

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' (collectively "Wilson's") motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 58) of the Court's order granting in part and denying in part Defendants' (collectively "VFI's") motion to dismiss (Dkt. 44). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies Wilson's motion for the reasons herein.

I. Factual and Procedural History

For a more complete factual background see the Court's order on VFI's motion to dismiss (Dkt. 44). On May 18, 2010, the Court granted in part VFI's motion to dismiss. Dkt. 44. On June 1, 2010, Wilson filed the instant motion for reconsideration. On June 2, 2010, the Court set a briefing schedule on the instant motion. Dkt. 56. On June 9, 2010, VFI responded to Wilson's motion for reconsideration. On June 11, 2010, Wilson replied.

II. DISCUSSION

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule CR 7(h), which provides as follows:

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).


The Court order on VFI's motion to dismiss (Dkt. 44) does not represent manifest error. The Court also concludes that Wilson's motion for reconsideration effectively restates the same arguments made in opposing VFI's motion to dismiss, and does not present new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to the Court's attention prior to this motion.

Because Wilson has not adequately met its burden under CR 7(h)(1), the Court denies Wilson's motion for reconsideration.

III. ORDER

Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Wilson's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED** for the reasons stated herein.

DATED this 15th day of June 2010.


BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge